

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 2, 2003 LB 210

laws, so the worker...so that domestic servants would also be required to be covered?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, it was not supposed to. I don't believe that it did.

SPEAKER BROMM: I'll read it again. But as I read the lines that it strikes, it struck me that it did. But I didn't hear you mention that in your discussion, so I just wanted to enquire about that. You check it again, if you would, please, and then correct me if I'm wrong on that. Or, I'll look at it also.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SPEAKER BROMM: Back to the issue at hand. I don't think we can stress enough that it is advantageous for workers as well as employers to have certainty in the conditions of their employment. When an employer feels that he is providing a certain benefit for an employee and intending to do so, it's important that that employee have that benefit. On the other hand, when that benefit is not provided, and it's understood by both employer and employee that it's not provided, and then after the fact the court says it should be provided, that's a disaster. That's a disaster for both parties, in some senses. Because when you're talking about the worker comp area, you have a conflict between paying benefits out of a work comp insurance policy and a health insurance policy. And where premiums are paid for a health insurance policy, the employee and their family believe that that is their benefit. The employer budgets for that, pays it, makes that a condition of employment, feels they are complying with the law. And then after the fact the court says, oh, we have a different interpretation of the law than the plain, simple reading of the law. The plain, simple reading of the law is, agricultural employees are exempt. That is the plain, simple reading of the law. The really only significant case prior to this recent one was one of a custom combine situation, where a person's only business was custom combining, where they traveled from state to state, they didn't own any of the grain, they didn't own any of the land, they owned the combines. They hired workers, they went in, they custom combined the wheat. And in that case, the court said,